

b) determining whether said first overtime condition occurs during said first time interval; and
E8
c) extending said first closing time using said second time interval in accordance with said determination.

REMARKS

The final Office Action dated September 11, 2000 (Paper No. 11) has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendments made in response thereto. Reconsideration of the grounds of objection and rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks herein.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 139-141 and 158-160 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sairamesh et al. ("Economic Framework for pricing and Charging Digital Libraries", D-Lib Magazine, February, 1996).

Claims 142-157 and 161-176 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim base.

Claims 9-33 and 89-138 are allowed.

The Amendment to the Claims

Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claims 139-141 and 158-160, in order to further prosecution, Applicants have deleted claims 139-141 and 158-160. The

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 09/311,557
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 046700-5004-01
Page 19

Examiner stated that claims 142-157 and 161-176 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 142-144, 146-148, 150, 152-157 and 161-163, 165-167, 169, 171-176 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 145, 149, 151, 158, 164, 168, 170 depend from amended allowable claims 144, 148, 150, 157, 163, 167 and 169. Accordingly, claims 9-33, 89-138, 142-157 and 161-176 are presently under consideration.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request timely allowance of claims 9-33, 89-138, 142-157 and 161-176.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Lesley L Coulson
Lesley L. Coulson
Reg. No. 46,642

Dated: October 27, 2000
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1800 M. St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5869
(202) 467-7000